



Charles D. Baker  
Governor

Karyn E. Polito  
Lieutenant Governor

Daniel Bennett  
Secretary

# *The Commonwealth of Massachusetts*

## *Department of Public Safety*

### *Board of Building Regulations and Standards*

*One Ashburton Place, Room 1301*

*Boston, Massachusetts 02108-1618*

*Phone (617) 727-3200*

*Fax (617) 727-5732*

*TTY (617) 727-0019*

[www.mass.gov/dps](http://www.mass.gov/dps)

**Matt Carlin**  
DPS Commissioner

**Richard Crowley**  
BBS Chair

**Thomas Perry**  
BBS Vice-Chair

**Felix Zemel**  
BBS Administrator

## **APPROVED MINUTES**

### **Board of Building Regulations and Standards (BBS)**

**DPS Training Room - 50 Maple Street - Milford - MA 01757**

**April 12, 2016 @ 1:00 p.m.**

#### **General notes on format of these minutes:**

- Votes are noted as **Motion** by, seconded by, and whether it was a unanimous or split vote.
- Agenda topics appear herein as numbered but may have been taken out of order as they appear on the meeting agenda.
- The April 12th Agenda is listed as **EXHIBIT A**; others are listed sequentially as addresses during the meeting.

1. Chairman, Richard Crowley (RC) opened the meeting at approximately 1:10 p.m. Roll call was taken as follows:

Richard Crowley V-Chair (RC)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Felix Zemel (FZ)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
John Couture (JC)	<input type="checkbox"/> present ✓ absent
Kevin Gallagher (KG)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Cheryl Lavalley (CL)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Kerry Dietz (KD)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent

Thomas Perry (TP)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Peter Ostroskey* (PO)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Monica Simmons (MS)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Michael McDowell (MM)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Chris Penne (CP)	✓ present <input type="checkbox"/> absent

\* Jen Hoyt (JH) participated as the designee for State Fire Marshal, Peter Ostroskey.

2. Chairman RC introduced PE Cheryl Lavalley, newly appointed member representing structural engineers of the commonwealth. Cheryl thanked Board members for the welcome and expressed her excitement about working with the Board.

Chairman RC also recognized Jerry Ludwig for his service on the Board over these last several years. Chairman RC indicated that he would compose a letter of thanks to Jerry for review at the next meeting.

3. On a **MOTION** by MM seconded by FZ it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes (**EXHIBIT B**) for the March 8, 2016 BBRS meeting with the following revisions:

**Page 2, point number 3, revise** as follows (*Correction provided by Chairman RC*):

Chairman RC indicated that new BBRS staff ~~may~~ will ~~take another review, differing look at~~ the white paper regarding the cost effectiveness of sprinklers in 3 – 6 unit residential buildings ~~drafted last year, but no further action at this time.~~

**Page 2, point number 4, revise** as follows (*Correction provided by JH*):

JH indicated that these requirements originate in general law (M.G.L. c. 148, §26G) and are beyond the purview of Board members. ~~However, we (fire services) are not OPPOSED to lowering the limits to 7,500 SF in the building code.~~

4. Chairman RC allowed State Building Inspector, William Horrocks (*who represents Board members on the Building Official Certification Committee - BOCC*), to address agenda items 5, pertaining to the BOCC meeting minutes, and 7, pertaining to MGL c 143 appointing authority reporting requirements, out of order.

Inspector Horrocks first addressed concerns that BOCC members have with information that they are receiving from municipalities on New Employee Report Forms (NERF) that are required to confirm appropriately appointed and qualified building commissioners and inspectors of buildings. Massachusetts General Law (MGL) c 143 §3 establishes that a municipal building commissioner or inspector of buildings “. . . shall report directly to and be responsible to only the person or public body that appointed him”. The NERFs require the signature of the appointing authority. Typically, the appointing authority is the mayor in a city and chair of the board of selectpersons in a town. BOCC members are receiving forms signed by town managers or others who do not appear to meet the intent of the law.

Chairman RC further explained that the law attempts to ensure that a building inspector is not unduly influenced by an intermediary. However, it appears that, in some instances, intermediaries are placed between the building commissioner and appointing authority, potentially affecting the building official’s ability to appropriately enforce the code.

Inspector Horrocks indicated that BOCC members revised the NERF to clarify that the appointing authority is considered to be the mayor or select board chair. Language was added to the form to request verification in the form of a vote if the city\town has appointed someone other than the mayor or chair to serve as the appointing authority. FZ indicated that Board Member, John Couture (*who could not attend the meeting*) asked for a few changes to be made to the NERF as well.

Inspector Horrocks suggested that the Board consider maintaining a list of appropriately qualified and certified inspectors, requiring cities and towns to draw from the list when filling inspector appointments. FZ indicated that Kimberly Spencer already retains such information. FZ asked Inspector Horrocks to develop procedures to indicate how the suggested system may be implemented.

Following discussion, on a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by MM it was unanimously voted to incorporate suggested changes to the NERF (**Exhibit C**) and endorse the new form for use by the BOCC.

5. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by MM it was unanimously voted approve the Building Official Certification Committee (BOCC) minutes for the March 2, 2016 meeting (**Exhibit D**).

On discussion, KD asked about appointing authority issues that were raised relative to previous BOCC meeting minutes where Board members did not endorse portions of the minutes pertaining to appointing authority concerns.

Kimberly Spencer explained that she has followed-up with each issue of concern raised in attempt to resolve, but is sometimes difficult to achieve compliance.

KG questioned whether there are many inspectors appointed prior to becoming certified and if many candidates receive extensions to exam requirements during the certification process.

Inspector Horrocks explained that many local inspectors are appointed prior to becoming certified, but a building commissioner\inspector of buildings (*highest level inspector in an office*) is required to be at least certified as a local inspector prior to appointment. Inspector Horrocks confirmed that many candidates apply for and receive extensions, but there is a limit of three (3) extensions. Typically, extensions are awarded in six (6) month intervals, but there are times when longer periods are approved if circumstances warrant.

Inspector Horrocks emphasized that municipalities tend not to be supportive of inspectors as they move through the process. Most inspectors need to prepare and study for exams on their own time and use vacation time to take an exam. TP confirmed that this was true when he went through the process. KG acknowledged that he encountered the same when advancing through fire service ranks.

6. Rob Anderson provided an update on recently presented and upcoming programs of education, indicating that he provided four (4) sessions to state and municipal building inspectors introducing the Ninth Edition Residential Code during late February into March; six (6) sessions to public health authorities relating to amusement device and challenge course safety regulations in March; and State Building Inspector Gordon Bailey just completed a 10 week Local Inspector Exam Preparation Course, with the hopes of segueing into an Inspector of Buildings\Building Commissioner Prep Course. Additional trainings relating to the Ninth Edition, Trench Safety and Residential HVAC requirements are being planned for the coming months.

KD inquired about code trainings specifically sponsored by the BBRS and KG was concerned about offering Ninth Edition trainings prior to finalizing its contents. FZ explained that BBRS sponsored trainings are primarily offered to state and municipal building inspectors to satisfy statutory obligations. However, we hope to expand offerings to licensees and others interested parties as the program grows. During recent trainings, staff has made it clear to attendees that certain Ninth Edition code content is not finalized and may be subject to change.

7. FZ indicated that the Ninth Edition remains under ANF review through the Executive Order (EO) 562 process. Although there have been numerous meetings to review content, the code has not

been released for public hearing. MGL c 143 §97 requires Board members to convene a public hearing in May. It is possible, but not likely, that the requisite May hearing date may include a review of the Ninth Edition.

In response to Board member questions, DPS Counsel, Steven Carley, indicated that ANF questions relate mainly to Stretch Energy provisions, manufactured buildings and requirements for tall wood structures. Counsel Carley indicated that there is a 35 day period between receiving ANF approval and the scheduling of a public hearing, so a May date seems aggressive and a July 1<sup>st</sup> implementation date is tight. However, once a public hearing is approved and final content is determined, Board members may select a suitable effective date for the code later in the year if the July date is not attainable.

8. FZ indicated that there have been several bills recently filed that may affect contents of the building code. He made clear that neither he nor Board members may comment on the bills without appropriate authorization, but indicated that DPS counsel will periodically provide a status update so that Board members and respective constituent groups are aware of the bills.
9. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by MM it was unanimously voted to approve the appointment of Rob Anderson to the Building Official Certification Committee (BOCC) representing academia. In his new role as education director as well as experience with Northeastern University, it was determined that Rob meets qualifications necessary to be assigned to the role. Chairman RC issued a letter of appointment (**Exhibit E**).
10. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by MM it was unanimously voted to approve 107 new construction supervisor licenses.
11. On a **MOTION** by MM seconded by TP it was unanimously voted to approve Steven T. Hapenny (CS-097042) and Patrick G. Courtney (CS-077667) for reinstatement of license due to medical issues.
12. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by MM, in accordance with previously established Board policies, it was unanimously voted to approve issuance of a construction supervisor license to Raphael Magri based on a section average passing score.
13. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by TP it was unanimously voted to table and continue discussions concerning the request of Paul Daniele and Atanas Pernikliev for approval of their qualifications to sit for the construction supervisor license exam. FZ indicated that the candidates should be required to submit original certified documents for consideration before Board members take action on the requests.

On discussion, Rob Anderson explained that candidates for the construction supervisor license exam are required to demonstrate that they possess at three (3) years of experience in building construction or design. The qualifications are not specific as to the type of experience, however, there are specific methods in which a candidate must demonstrate compliance; either in the form of a letter of attestation from a former employer or by submittal of W-2 forms. At times, candidates are not able to adhere to these standards and therefore ask for Board members to consider alternate methods of compliance.

14. On a **MOTION** by KG seconded by MM it was unanimously voted to approve a revision to construction supervisor license exam candidate's qualifications, allowing a candidate to substitute an associate's degree (*in construction or building design*) for one year of experience.

On discussion, and as mentioned above, candidates must demonstrate 3 years of experience in building construction or design. Currently, Chairman RC explained, Board members allow credit towards experience for vocational school training and other higher education degrees. A candidate may substitute a vocational degree for one year of experience and higher education degrees may be credited with two years of experience. It seems logical that some credit should be offered for an associate's degree.

15. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by MM it was unanimously voted to approve the make-up of the *Construction Supervisor License Exam Transition Committee* with the following **revisions**:

Felix Zemel	Steve Kennealy	Lowell Building Inspector, Chris McWhite
Rob Anderson	Marc LaPointe	Peabody Building Commissioner Albert Talarico
Tom Riley	John Bennett	Thomas Hopkins
DOER Representative	Homebuilder Rep.	AGC (Commercial Contractor) Rep.

TP was concerned that adding too many members may cause a quorum issue. DPS Counsel, Steve Carley, indicated that, although meeting notices and the like may need to be posted for OML compliance, members are not subject to strict quorum requirements.

In response to a question by Rob Anderson, Chairman RC confirmed that the desired date for exam transition to the Ninth Edition of the Building Code is January 1, 2017.

*The following motions pertain to a series of revisions proposed to the **Draft Ninth Edition Building Code**. The proposals are provided as part of these minutes, labeled as **Exhibit F**; approved proposals will be incorporated into the draft code for review at public hearing. For clarity, proposed changes are also appended within the motions below.*

16. On a **MOTION** by KD seconded by JH it was unanimously voted to approve the inclusion of a definition for **fire official** as "*The head of the fire department, or his/her designee as defined in MGL c 148 §1.*"

On discussion, FZ indicated that the current draft code references the term **fire official** numerous times, but does not provide a definition. This change helps to clarify what is meant.

17. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by MM it was unanimously voted to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to fire protection maintenance requirements under Section 901.3 with the stipulation that staff would develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with DFS to clearly establish appeal authority for disputed violations.

**901.3 Maintenance.** *All fire protection systems shall be maintained in accordance with sections 901.3.1 through 901.3.4 and applicable provisions of 527 CMR, and may be enforced by both the Building Official and Fire Official. The owner of every building or structure shall be responsible for the care and maintenance of all fire protection systems, including equipment and devices, to ensure the safety and welfare of the occupants.*

*No person shall shut off, disconnect, obstruct, remove or destroy, or cause or permit to be shut off, disconnected, obstructed, removed or destroyed, any part of any sprinkler system, water main, hydrant or other device used for fire protection or carbon monoxide detection and alarm in any building owned, leased or occupied by such person or under his control or supervision, without first procuring a written permit to do so from the Fire Official of the city or town wherein such building is situated in accordance with MGL c. 148 § 27A.*

*When installations of fire protection systems are interrupted for repairs or other necessary reasons, the owner shall immediately notify the Fire Official and shall diligently prosecute the restoration of the protection.*

On discussion, KD was concerned that the language appears to create dual authority for the same issue. She questioned how the change makes matters clearer and asked who will arbitrate disputes. She expressed that she has witnessed dual enforcement difficulties first hand.

FZ indicated that statutorily, both building and fire services have some authority over fire protection systems. The revised language attempts to clarify on-going jurisdictional issues and overreach of enforcement. FZ recognized fire services for their efforts to help clarify the code language and responsibilities.

JH indicated that this issue is not new to the Ninth Edition Code. Language is a bit unclear in the eighth and earlier code editions. Therefore, at times, there are disputes raised concerning the appropriate enforcement of fire protection maintenance provisions. This proposal helps clarify roles.

Audience member, Dan Walsh, speaking as a building code enforcement official from the Town of Concord, indicated that this authority issue caused consternation during development of the Eighth Edition Code. Mr. Walsh indicated that, through arduous efforts, building and fire service personnel presented language that was adopted by Board members for inclusion in the Eighth Edition. The approved authority language took a long time to develop and was palatable to both groups (*building and fire services*). Mr. Walsh stressed that proposed language identifies two authorities and does not provide remedy to the reader if there is a dispute.

Audience member and DFS Marshal, Peter Ostroskey, indicated that the language change under discussion relates only to fire protection maintenance requirements whereas the joint proposal building and fire services for inclusion in the Eighth Edition pertained to general enforcement of the code; they are separate and distinct items.

MS questioned where an aggrieved party would file an appeal.

FZ indicated that an appeal would be filed with whichever board is appropriate; at times with the Building Code Appeals Board (BCAB) at other times with the DFS Appeals Board. JH indicated that, typically, a violation notice is issued by the building inspector and aggrieved parties file with the Building Code Appeals Board (BCAB).

18. On a **MOTION** by KG seconded by KD it was unanimously voted to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to fire protection maintenance requirements under Section 901.3.1.

**901.3.1 Water-based fire protection systems.** All water-based fire protection systems shall be maintained in accordance with NFPA 25 and applicable provisions of 527 CMR.

19. On a **MOTION** by JH seconded by FZ it was unanimously voted to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to fire protection maintenance requirements under Section 901.3.2.

**901.3.2 Fire alarm, smoke detection, fire detection, and heat detection systems.** All fire alarm, smoke detection, fire detection, and heat detection systems shall be maintained in accordance with NFPA 72 and applicable provisions of 527 CMR.

20. A **MOTION** was presented by FZ and seconded by MM to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to carbon monoxide requirements under Section 901.3.3, pending a review by DPS legal counsel to ensure that the action is within jurisdictional boundaries of the Board. Following discussion, the **MOTION** was not approved on a vote of 1 in favor (FZ), 1 abstention (JH), 8 opposed (RC, TP, KG, CL, KD, MM, MS, CP).

On discussion, JH indicated that DFS supports the increased public safety intended by the code change proposal but believes a retroactive provision to install carbon monoxide protection is not appropriate for 780 CMR. Rather, the correct promulgation procedure would be through the legislature. Accordingly, she indicated that she would abstain from any vote taken on the matter.

KD questioned how a retroactive provision can be enforced and questioned the financial implications of retroactive provisions made part of the building code, indicating that she believed the measure reaches beyond jurisdictional boundaries of the Board.

TP expressed that the proposal does not address maintenance of existing systems, but rather, establishes criteria for new systems. Further, he was concerned that, if the measure is made part of the Ninth Edition draft for public review, it may slow-down the process.

KG suggested that the proposal may be better addressed as an independent filing, perhaps amending the Ninth Edition once\if jurisdictional concerns are abated.

MM questioned whether or not the language would affect buildings that do not incorporate fossil fuel burning devices.

In response to other Board member questions, FZ indicated that the measure is not intended for buildings without a source of carbon monoxide (*fossil fuel burning devices*) and stressed that the proposal is offered only if determined appropriate via a legal review. Additionally, he indicated that public comment on the measure would also help determine appropriateness of retroactive building code language.

Following discussion, a majority of Board members believed that there were too many concerns with regard to the proposal and voted in opposition of the motion (*as indicated above*). However, Board members expressed that staff may still pursue legal review of the proposal to determine if it is appropriate to present as an independent code change to the Ninth Edition draft code.

**901.3.3 Carbon monoxide detection systems.** All carbon monoxide-related systems shall be maintained in accordance with NFPA 720 and applicable provisions of 527 CMR.

*Within one (1) year of promulgation of this unit, Carbon Monoxide detection shall be installed in all existing E and I use groups in the locations prescribed in Section 915.2, but these units may be either battery-operated or hard-wired/interconnected.*

*Carbon monoxide detection systems shall be installed in all existing E and I use groups in full compliance with Section 915 within five (5) years of the effective date of this regulation.*

NOTE: LANGUAGE TO BE REVIEWED BY LEGAL COUNSEL PRIOR TO FINAL PROMULGATION

21. On a **MOTION** by KG seconded by KD it was unanimously voted to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to fire protection maintenance requirements under Section 901.3.4.

**901.3.4 Other fire protection systems.** *All fire protection systems not addressed in 901.3.1 through 901.3.4 shall be maintained in accordance with applicable provisions of 527 CMR.*

22. A **MOTION** was presented by FZ and seconded by TP to approve Table 903.2 (*excerpted below*) relative to fire sprinkler protection requirements. Following discussion, Board members determined the suggested table required numerous corrections and/or updates. Consequently, the MOTION was withdrawn.

Another **MOTION** was presented by FZ and seconded by TP to direct staff to update the table, allowing thresholds for state-owned buildings, based on meeting discussions and forward the revised table with footnote information to the Fire Prevention\Fire Protection Committee (FPFP) for review and comment.

On discussion, audience member and Building Official Federation President, Curt Meskus, indicated that this issue was first raised by the federation whereby members proposed a change to align building code requirements with the general law to avert conflict and ensure that code users and enforcers are aware of the MGL requirements. Additionally, federation members requested a study of how the laws are currently enforced by municipal inspectors to determine equity of application. Mr. Meskus indicated that the proposed table revisions appears to disregard whether or not water is available to feed required sprinklers systems, which is inherent in the law.

Additionally, audience members Mike DiMasio and Robert Carasitti expressed concern that the table did not accurately portray requirements of the law and suggested that further review of the rather complex matter is necessary.

FZ suggested that this issue could be resolved by adding a footnote specifying that the table applies only if a suitable water supply is available for use.

JH noted that a specific, detailed footnote to address water availability issues should be written, reviewed and approved by Board members prior to voting approval of any table revisions.

**Table 903.2 Locations.** *Change the following items, as follows, but retain the occupant and location thresholds.*

Action	Current Requirement	Revision
Replace	B > 12,000 sf	With B > 7,500
Replace	E [below level of exit discharge]	With E
Replace	Note f (1). > 12,000 sf	With > 7,500 sf

Replace	F-1 [all other] > 12,000 sf	With F [all others] > 7,500 sf
Replace	M [all others] > 12,000 sf	With M [all others] > 7,500 sf AND more than three (3) stories above grade plane.
Replace	S-1 [all others] > 12,000 sf	With S-1 [all others] > 7,500 sf
<b>Action</b>	<b>Current Requirement</b>	<b>Revision</b>
Add		S-1 [with repair garage] > 7,500 sf area located in basement or more than three (3) stories above grade plane.
<b>Action</b>	<b>Current Requirement</b>	<b>Revision</b>
Delete	E [all others]	
	F-1 [all types]	
	M [all types]	
	S-1 [with repair garage, building two (2) or more stories above grade.]	
	S-1 [with repair garage, building one (1) or more stories above grade.]	
	S-1 [all types]	

23. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by MM it was unanimously voted to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to carbon monoxide requirements under Section 915.2.

**915.2 Locations.** *Where required by Section 915.1.1, carbon monoxide detection shall be installed in the locations specified in Sections 915.2.1 through 915.2.3 or in accordance with the technical options listed in applicable sections of 527 CMR, as well as all applicable provisions of 527 CMR and 248 CMR.*

24. On a **MOTION** by KG seconded by TP it was unanimously voted to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to carbon monoxide requirements under Section 915.3.

**915.3 Interconnection.** *Where more than one listed carbon monoxide alarm or combination smoke/carbon monoxide detector is required to be installed within a dwelling unit, or E- or I- use area, they shall be interconnected in such a manner that the activation of the carbon monoxide alarm or combination smoke/carbon monoxide detector shall activate the carbon monoxide audible notification devices throughout the individual dwelling unit, or affected area, by the detector or separate notification device.*

25. On a **MOTION** by JH seconded by KG it was unanimously voted to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to fire protection requirements under Section 34:302.6.

**34:302.6 Fire protection of R-use buildings.** *When performing work regulated by MGL c. 148 § 26E, a building permit shall be obtained from the Building Official, and all detection devices must be installed in locations prescribed in applicable provisions of 527 CMR. This section shall be enforced by the Fire Official.*

On discussion, audience member and Building Inspector Federation President, Curt Meskus, expressed concern that battery operated detection systems allowed by the law are typically installed without the need for a building permit whereas hard-wired systems require issuance of a building permit. Mr. Meskus was concerned that the requirement may cause more system installations absent the issuance of a building permit.

Audience member, Grafton Building Commissioner, Robert Berger, indicated that a permit is needed in either case to ensure that the devices are installed in locations specified by the law.

JH noted that 527 CMR no longer requires installation permits for fire protection system since requirements are typically specified by the building code. However, in this instance there is a gap that needs to be filled with appropriate direction to the installer.

26. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by KG it was unanimously voted to approve language (*excerpted below*) relative to fire protection sprinkler requirements for townhouse units under Section R313.1.

**R313.1** Restore exception to base code language and delete Exception 2. [NOTE: relevant to Townhouse sprinklers].

On discussion, FZ indicated that the revision restores the Ninth Edition draft code to align with both the Eighth Edition and model International Residential Code (IRC) requirements by requiring sprinklers in townhouses irrespective of fire separation.

Chairman RC expressed that, initially, he was adamantly opposed to requiring sprinklers when townhouse units are separated by 2-hour fire separation walls; believing that proper compartmentalization works well. However, having reviewed the matter on numerous occasions with varied sources and some recent fire data, he indicated, have altered his opinions at this point.

Audience member, FPDF Chairman, Robert Carasitti, asked if the P2904 language contained in the IRC (*which establishes presumptive equivalent installation standards to NFPA 13D*) will be allowed in MA and whether the reader will be directed to the base International Building Code (IBC) for any reason.

FZ indicated that compliance with Section P2904 would not be permitted and the reader would not be directed to the base code and further indicated that staff would develop guiding FAQs to explain the requirement.

27. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by TP it was unanimously voted to rescind Official Interpretation Number 2015\_01 relating to utility sponsored and other minor energy efficiency upgrades and directed staff to revisit the issue and appropriately revise the interpretation.

On discussion, FZ indicated that there have been several news articles and inquiries regarding the interpretation and expressions of concern by municipal inspectors.

Audience member, Dedham Building Commissioner, Ken Cimeno, informed Board members that he was recently called to a 2-alarm fire in Dedham where it is suspected that improper spray-foam insulation installation may have been the cause. Although cause is not definitive at this point, Mr. Cimeno expressed that the fire is indicative of concerns he has with interpretation; most particularly, the lack of oversight since permitting requirements are eliminated for certain projects. Commissioner Cimeno said that he understands and appreciates the intent of issuing the interpretation, but is concerned with unintended consequences.

In response to a question by DFS Marshal, Peter Ostroskey, FZ confirmed that the interpretation will be removed from the DPS website and clarification will be issued to building officials and

interested parties. In the interim, permits must be secured for insulation projects referenced in the interpretation.

28. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by TP it was unanimously voted to direct staff to review Section R501.3 in view of an article that published in the *Structural Building Component ~~Advertise~~ Contact* (SBC) Magazine titled *7 Reasons to Immediately Delete Exception 4 from R501.3* (Exhibit G) to determine an appropriate proposal for review by the Fire Prevention\Fire Protection Committee (FPFP), DFS Fire Marshal, Fire Chiefs and Building Official Federation.
29. On a **MOTION** by FZ seconded by KD it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at approximately 3:51 p.m.

**EXHIBITS:**

---

- A. April 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting Agenda.
- B. BBRS Meeting Minutes March 8, 2016 (*Approved as amended*).
- C. Revised Building Official Certification Committee (BOCC) *New Employee Report Form* (NERF).
- D. Building Official Certification Committee (BOCC) March 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes.
- E. Rob Anderson letter of appointment to the BOCC.
- F. Proposed revisions to the *Ninth Edition Draft Code*.
- G. SBC Magazine article titled *7 Reasons to Immediately Delete Exception 4 from R501.3*.